arXiv:1108.3598v2 [math.CV] 12 Sep 2011

THE DIEDERICH-FORNAESS INDEX AND THE GLOBAL REGULARITY OF THE $\bar\partial$-NEUMANN PROBLEM

STEFANO PINTON AND GIUSEPPE ZAMPIERI

Abstract. We describe along the guidelines of Kohn [11], the constant $\mathcal{E}_s$ which is needed to control the commutator of a totally real vector field $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ with $\bar\partial^*$ in order to have H^s a-priori estimates for the Bergman projection B_k, $k \geq q-1$, on a smooth q-pseudoconvex domain $D \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$. This statement, not explicit in [11], yields regularity results for B_k in specific Sobolev degree s. Next, we refine the pseudodifferential calculus at the boundary in order to relate, for a defining function r of D, the operators $(T^+)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$. We are thus able to extend to general degree $k \geq 0$ of B_k, the conclusion of [11] which only holds for $q = 1$ and $k = 0$: if for the Diederich-Fornaess index δ of D, we have $(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathcal{E}_s$, then B_k is H^s-regular.
MSC: 32F10, 32F20, 32N15, 32T25

1. Introduction

The regularity of the Bergman projection B_k over forms of degree $k \geq 0$, as well as of the Neumann operator N_k for $k \geq 1$ on a pseudoconvex domain $D \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$, has a long history. The first approach by Boas and Straube [2], [3] consists in requiring, for any ϵ, the existence of a totally real vector field T_ϵ, $|T_\epsilon| \sim 1$, such that

$$\Big|\langle \partial r, [\partial_{\bar z_i}, T_\epsilon]\rangle\Big|\Big|_{bD} < \epsilon, \quad i = 1, ..., n, \tag{1.1}$$

where r is a defining function with $|\partial r| = 1$. This is referred to as "good vector fields" condition. In other terms, we are requiring that all the coefficients of the T_ϵ components of $[\bar\partial^*, T_\epsilon]$ are small (modulo "good" terms); cf. [14] Proposition 5.26. This can be weakened to a "multiplier" condition for $[\bar\partial^*, T_\epsilon]$. Thus, the regularity of B_k, $k \geq 0$ and N_k, $k \geq 1$, is in fact related to the existence, for any ϵ, of a totally real vector field T_ϵ, with $|T_\epsilon| \sim 1$, such that

$$\|[\bar\partial^*, T_\epsilon]u\|^2 < \epsilon Q_1(u,u) + c_\epsilon\|u\|, \tag{1.2}$$

where $Q_1(u,u) = \|\bar\partial u\|_1^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|_1^2$. Indeed, in (1.1) and (1.2) one can make the weaker assumtion that T_ϵ is "approximately tangential", that is, $|T_\epsilon r| < \epsilon$; we refer for this point to the remarks after Theorem 5.22 of [14]. We deform the defining function r to $r_\epsilon = g_\epsilon r$ and, accordingly, we deform the vector field $T = 2\mathsf{Im}\frac{\sum_i r_{\bar i}\partial_{z_i}}{\sum_i |r_i|^2}$ to $T_{g_\epsilon} = 2\mathsf{Im}\frac{\sum_i (r_\epsilon)_{\bar i}\partial_{z_i}}{\sum_i |(r_\epsilon)_i|^2}$. The condition of approximate tangentiality turns into $|\mathsf{Im}\, g_\epsilon| < \epsilon$. These two deformations are related by $[\bar\partial^*, T_{g_\epsilon}] \sim (\partial\bar\partial r_\epsilon \lrcorner \bar\partial r_\epsilon)T_{g_\epsilon}$ modulo an error whose restriction to bD belongs to $T^{1,0}bD \oplus T^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n|_{bD}$; hence, the existence of r_ϵ such that

$$|\partial\bar\partial r_\epsilon \lrcorner \bar\partial r_\epsilon| \le \epsilon Q + c_\epsilon \Lambda^{-1}, \tag{1.3}$$

for $|\partial r_\epsilon| \sim 1$, implies (1.2). (Here Λ is the standard elliptic operator of order 1.) This is indeed the assumption under which Straube proves in [13] H^s-regularity for any s. In particular, this condition is fulfilled when there is a smooth defining function r such that $\partial\bar\partial r|_{bD} \ge 0$; in this case one takes, for any ϵ, $r_\epsilon = r$ in (1.3) and $T_\epsilon = T$ in (1.2) respectively (cf. the proof of Theorem 2.4 below). Note that, historically, the conclusion was obtained, instead, through the "good vector fields" condition. However how this follows from the fact that there exists r which is plurisubharmonic on bD is not immediate (Remark 2.6 below). In any case, (1.1) calls into play a full family $\{T_\epsilon\}$ and the way of getting T_ϵ from the initial T is involved. In [11], Kohn has given a quantitative result on regularity: he has specified, for given s, and by allowing a full flexibility in the choice of g, not necessarily $g \sim 1$, which is the constant $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}$ which is needed in (1.2) or (1.3) for H^s-regularity. This is not explicitly stated, but is entirely contained in [11] which, in turn, goes back to [3]. If this is separated from the body of the paper, as we do in Theorem 2.3, and under an additional assumption of uniformity under exhaustion, it gives H^s-estimates; this separation only requires minor modifications and yields a conclusion which naturally extends to forms of any degree $k \ge q$ on q-pseudoconvex domains.

It has been proved by Diederich-Fornaess in [4] that every domain possesses an index δ with $0 < \delta \le 1$ such that $-(-r_\delta)^\delta$ is plurisubharmonic. Again, r_δ is in the form $r_\delta = g_\delta r$ for some g_δ. On the other hand, it has been proved by Barret [1] that given a Sobolev index $s \searrow 0$, one can find a domain D in which B_k fails H^s-regularity; according to [4], for these domains, one has $\delta \searrow 0$. So the relation between the index of regularity s and the Diederich-Fornaess index δ is an attractive problem. Indeed, what is explicitly stated by Kohn and is by far the most interesting content of [11], is the way of obtaining $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}$ out of δ. This is described through the estimate of the Levi form

$$(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\left|\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta) \lrcorner \bar\partial r_\delta\right| \underset{\sim}{<} (1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}.$$

(For an operator Op, such as Op$= (-r_\delta)^\delta$, we define Q_{Op} by $Q_{\mathrm{Op}}(u,u) = \|\mathrm{Op}\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\mathrm{Op}\bar\partial^* u\|^2$.) In this estimate, one enjois the presence of the factor $(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. When $(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}$, one expects s-regularity by what has been said above, but this is not given for free because one encounters the unpleasant factor $(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$. It is well known that $(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \sim (T^+)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ when the action is restricted to harmonic functions. For this reason, Kohn can prove regularity for the projection B_0 on 0-forms, since this factorizes through the projection over harmonic functions. The main task of the present paper is to develop an accurate pseudodifferential calculus at the boundary which relates the action of $(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $(T^+)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ over general functions by describing the error terms by means of Δ. In this way, when

$(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}$, we get H^s-regularity of B_k in general degree $k \ge 0$ (resp. $k \ge q-1$) on a pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconvex) domain.

Recent contribution to regularity of the Bergman projection by the method of the "multiplier" is given by Straube in the already mentioned paper [13] and Herbig-McNeal [6]; a combination of the "multiplier" and "potential" method (inspired to the "(P)-Property" by Catlin) is developed by Khanh [7] and Harrington [5].

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Emil Straube for important advice.

2. Weak s-compactness and H^s-regularity

Let D be a bounded smooth domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by $r < 0$ for $\partial r \neq 0$. We modify the defining function as gr for $g \in C^\infty$ and use the notation r_g or r^g for gr. We use the lower scripts i and $\bar{j}$ to denote derivative in ∂_{z_i} and $\partial_{\bar{z}_j}$ respectively and work with various vector fields such as

$$N_g = \frac{\sum_i r^g_{\bar{i}} \partial_{z_i}}{\sum_i |r^g_i|^2}, \qquad L^g_j = \partial_{z_j} - r^g_j N_g, \qquad T_g = -i(N_g - \bar{N}_g). \tag{2.1}$$

The L^g_j's are complex-tangential; T_g is the complementary real-tangential vector field. We consider an orthonormal basis $\bar{\omega}_1, ..., \bar{\omega}_n$ of antiholomorphic 1-forms and general forms u of degree k, that is, expressions of type $u = \sum'_{|J|=k} u_J \bar{\omega}_J$ where $J = j_1 < ... j_k$ are ordered multiindices and $\bar{\omega}_J = \bar{\omega}_1 \wedge ... \wedge \bar{\omega}_k$. We use the notations

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{Span}\{L^g_j,\ \partial_{\bar{z}_j},\ \text{for } j = 1, ..., n\}, \qquad Q_s(u,u) = \|\bar\partial u\|^2_s + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2_s.$$

We have (cf. [3] p. 83) for $u \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$,

$$\|Su\|^2_{s-1} \underset{\sim}{<} Q_{s-1}(u,u) + \|u\|_s \|u\|_{s-1} \quad \text{for any } S \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{2.2}$$

Since $\mathcal{S} \oplus \mathbb{C}T_g = \mathbb{C} \otimes T\mathbb{C}^n$, then (2.2) implies

$$\|u\|^2_s \underset{\sim}{<} Q_{s-1}(u,u) + \|T^s_g u\|^2 + \|u\|_s \|u\|_{s-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

With the notation $\bar{\theta}_j := -\frac{1}{\sum_i |r^g_i|^2} \sum_i r^g_{i\bar{j}} r^g_{\bar{i}}$, we define

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\Theta}_g u = \sum'_{|K|=k-1} \sum_{ij} \left(\bar{\theta}^g_j u_{iK} - \bar{\theta}^g_i u_{jK} \right) + \text{error}, \\ \bar{\Theta}^*_g u = \sum'_{|K|=k-1} \sum_j \theta^g_j u_{jK} + \text{error}. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

We have the crucial commutation relation between T_g and the Euclidean derivatives ([11] Lemma 3.33)

$$[\partial_{\bar{z}_j}, T_g] = \bar{\theta}_j T_g \qquad \text{modulo } \mathcal{S}. \tag{2.5}$$

This implies

$$[\bar\partial, T_g] = \bar{\Theta}_g T_g \qquad \text{modulo } \mathcal{S}. \tag{2.6}$$

As for the commutation of the adjoint $\bar\partial^*$, we need a modification of T_g which preserves the condition of membership to $D_{\bar\partial^*}$. To this end, we define $\tilde T_g$ by

$$(\tilde T_g u)_{jK} = T_g u_{jK} + \frac{r^g_{\bar j}}{\sum_i |r_{\bar i}|^2}\sum_i [T_g, r^g_i]u_{iK}. \tag{2.7}$$

Thus $u \in D_{\bar\partial^*}$ implies $\tilde T_g u \in D_{\bar{\bar\partial}^*}$. Note that $\tilde T_g$ differs from T_g by a 0-order operator. With these preliminaries, (2.5) yields

$$[\bar\partial^*, \tilde T_g] = \bar\Theta^*_g \tilde T_g \qquad \text{modulo } \mathcal{S}. \tag{2.8}$$

Definition 2.1. Let s be a positive integer and let $1 \le q \le n-1$. We say that T^s_g well commutes with $\bar\partial^*$ in degree $\ge q$ when

$$\|\bar\Theta^*_g u\|^2 \le \mathcal{E}_{s,g} Q(u,u) + c_g \|u\|^2_{-1}, \qquad \text{for any } u \text{ of degree} \ge q, \tag{2.9}$$

and for $\mathcal{E}_{s,g} \le c_1^2 e^{-2c_2 s \,\mathrm{diam}^2 D} \inf\left(\frac{1}{|g|^s}\right)^{-1}$ or, alternatively, for $\mathcal{E}_{s,g} \le c_1^2 e^{-2c_2 s \,\mathrm{diam}^2 D \sup(1+\frac{|g'|}{|g|})}$, where c_1 is a small constant and c_2 is controlled by the C^2 norm of r_g.

We introduce the notion of q-pseudoconvexity of D; this consists in the requirement that, for the ordered eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \ldots \le \lambda_{n-1}$ of the Levi form $\partial\bar\partial r|_{\partial r^\perp}$, we have $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_j \ge 0$. The basic estimates show that the complex Laplacian $\Box$ is invertible over k-forms for $k \ge q$. We denote by N_k the inverse; we also denote by $B_k : L^{2,k} \to L^{2,k} \cap \ker \bar\partial$ the Bergman projection. Recall Kohn's formula $B_k = \mathrm{Id} - \bar\partial^*_{k+1} N_{k+1} \bar\partial_k$. We say that B_k is regular, resp. s-exactly regular, when it preserves C^∞, respectively H^s, the s-Sobolev space.

Remark 2.2. Assume that for any s there is r_g with $|\partial r_g| \sim 1$, that is $|g| \sim 1$, such that $|\Theta^*_g u| \le c_1 e^{-c_2 s \,\mathrm{diam}^2 D}$; then there is exact s-regularity for any s.

We recall from [2] that s-exact regularity of N_k is equivalent to s-exact of the triplet B_{k-1}, B_k, B_{k+1}.

Theorem 2.3. *Let D be q-peudoconvex and assume that for some g, T^s_g well commutes with $\bar\partial^*$ in degree $\ge q$. Assume also that this property of good commutation holds, with a uniform constant $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}$, for a strongly q-pseudoconvex exhaustion of D. Then for any form $f \in H^s$ we have that $B_k f \in H^s$ and*

$$\|B_k f\|_s \le c\|f\|_s, \qquad \textit{for any } k \ge q-1. \tag{2.10}$$

The proof is intimately related to [3]. Formally, it follows the lines of [11] but also contains ideas taken from [7].

Proof. We first assume that we already know that B_k is regular for any $k \ge q-1$ and prove (2.10) for a constant c which only depends on (2.9). In other terms, we show that (2.10) holds for c if we knew from the beginning that it holds for some $c' >> c$. We reason by induction. An n form is 0 at bD ; thus N_n "gains two derivatives" by elliptic regularity of $\Box$ in the interior and hence B_{n-1} is regular. We assume now that B_k is s-regular and prove that the same is true for B_{k-1}. We use the notation f for the test form in our proof; the notation u, which occurs in (2.9), will be reserved to $\bar\partial N_k f$. It suffices to estimate $\|T^s_g B_{k-1} f\|$ since, by (2.3), this controls the full norm $\|B_{k-1}f\|_s$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|T^s_g B_{k-1}f\|^2 &= \big(T^s_g B_{k-1}f, T^s_g f\big) - \big(T^s_g B_{k-1}f, T^s_g\bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial f\big)\\
&= \underbrace{\big(T^s_g B_{k-1}f, T^s_g f\big)}_{(a)} - \underbrace{\big(T^{s*}_g T^s_g\bar\partial B_{k-1}f, N_k\bar\partial f\big)}_{(b)}\\
&\qquad - \underbrace{\big([\bar\partial, T^{s*}_g T^s_g]B_{k-1}f, N_k\bar\partial f\big)}_{(c)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.11}
$$

Now, $(a) \le sc\|T^s_g B_{k-1}f\|^2 + lc\|T^s_g f\|^2$, whereas $(b) = 0$. The term which comes with small constant can be absorbed because we know a-priori that $\|T^s_g B_{k-1}f\| < \infty$. As for the last term, we replace T^s_g by $\tilde T^s_g$ modulo an operator of order $s-1$, that we regard as an error term, describe the commutator in the left of (c) by $\bar\Theta_g$ according to (2.6), switch it to the right as $\bar\Theta^*_g$ and end up with

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(c)| &\le \Big|\big(2s\bar\Theta_g\tilde T^s_g B_{k-1}f, \tilde T^s_g N_k\bar\partial f\big)\Big| + \text{error}\\
&\le sc\|T^s_g B_{k-1}f\|^2 + lc\,s\|\bar\Theta^*_g T^s_g N_k\bar\partial f\|^2 + \text{error}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.12}
$$

The error includes terms in $(s-1)$-norm and terms in which derivatives belonging to $\mathcal{S}$ occur (cf. (2.2)). We use the hypothesis (2.8) under the choice $\mathcal{E}_{s,g} \le c_1^2 c^{-2c_2 s\,\mathrm{diam}^2 D}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}$ and get, with the notation $u = N_k\bar\partial f$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\bar\Theta^*_g\tilde T^s_g u\|^2 &\le \sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\|\bar\Theta^*_g\tilde T^s u\|^2\\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}Q(\tilde T^s u, \tilde T^s u) + \text{error}\\
&\le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\big(Q_{\tilde T^s}(u,u) + \|[\bar\partial, \tilde T^s]u\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial^*, \tilde T^s]u\|^2\big) + \text{error}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.13}
$$

(In case $\mathcal{E}_{s,g} \le c_1^2 e^{-2c_2 s\,\mathrm{diam}^2 D(1+\sup\frac{|g'|}{|g|})}$ we have not to replace $\tilde T^s_g$ by $\tilde T^s$ and, instead, use the estimate

$$
|[\tilde T^s_g, \bar\partial]v| \underset{\sim}{<} c_2\sup(1+\frac{|g'|}{|g|})|\tilde T_g v| \quad \text{modulo } Sv \text{ for } S\in\mathcal{S},
\tag{2.14}
$$

and similarly for $\bar\partial$ replaced by $\bar\partial^*$; the proof will proceed similarly as below.)

Now,

$$Q_{\tilde{T}^s}(u,u) \underset{\sim}{<} \|T^s f\|^2 + \|T^s B_{k-1} f\|^2 + \text{error}.$$

Next,

$$\|[\bar{\partial}, \tilde{T}^s]u\|^2 \leq c_2 s^2 \, \|T^s N_k \bar{\partial} f\|^2 + \text{error}.$$

We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} N_k \bar{\partial} &= B_k N_k \bar{\partial}(\mathrm{Id} - B_{k-1}) \\ &= B_k e^{-\varphi_s} N_{k,\varphi_s} \bar{\partial} e^{\varphi_s}(\mathrm{Id} - B_{k-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where N_{k,φ_s} is the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator weighted by $e^{-\varphi_s} = e^{-c_2 s|z|^2}$. Since $[D^s, \bar{\partial}]$ is an operator of degree s with coefficients controlled by sc_2 for $c_2 \sim \|r\|_{C^2}$, then $N_{k,\varphi_s}\bar{\partial}$ is continuous in $H^s_{\varphi_s}$ with a continuity constant that we can assume to be unitary. We use that $c_2 s^2 \, e^{-2c_2 s \,\mathrm{diam}^2 D} \leq \inf\limits_{z \in D} e^{-2c_2 s|z|^2}$ (for different c_2) in order to remove weights from the norms. We also use the inductive assumption that (2.10) holds for B_k. In this way, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{s,g} \sup \frac{1}{|g|^{2s}} c_2 s^2 \, \|T^s \bar{\partial} N_k f\|^2 &\leq c_1^2 \left(\|T^s f\|^2 + \|T^s B_{k-1} f\|^2 \right) + \text{error} \\ &\leq c_1^2 (\|T^s_g f\|^2 + \|T^s B_{k-1} f\|^2) + \text{error}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where the last inequality follows trivially from the fact that $T_g = \frac{1}{g} T$ for $\left|\frac{1}{g}\right| >> 1$. Here, $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}$ takes care of $\sup \frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}$ and also of the constant which arises from removing weights owing to $\mathcal{E}_{s,g} \leq c_1^2 e^{-2sc_2 \mathrm{diam}^2 D} \sup \frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}$. Altogether, up to absorbable terms, $\|T^s_g B_{k-1} f\|^2$ has been estimated by $lc\|T^s_g f\|^2 + \text{error}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.3 if we are able to remove the assumption that we already know that (2.10) holds for some $c' >> c$. For this, we recall that we are assuming that there is a strongly q-pseudoconvex exhaustion $D_\rho \nearrow D$ which satisfies (2.9) uniformly with respect to ρ. We observe that (2.10) holds over D_ρ for $c' = c'_\rho$. What has been proved above shows that it holds in fact with c independent of ρ. Passing to the limit over ρ we get (2.10) for D.

□

Theorem 2.4. *(Boas-Straube* [3]*) If there is a defining function r such that for the eigenvalues $\mu_1 \leq ... \leq \mu_n$ of the full Levi form $\partial\bar{\partial} r$ (not restricted to $\partial r^\perp$) we have $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{q} \mu_j \geq 0$, then, B_k is exactly H^s-regular for any s and any $k \geq q-1$.*

Proof. The proof consists in proving that (2.9) holds for any ϵ and uniformly over an exhaustion of D. More precisely, we will show that for any ϵ, for $\bar{\Theta}^*$ independent of ϵ (associated to a normalized defining function r), and for suitable c_ϵ, we have

$$\|\bar{\Theta}^* u\|^2 \leq \epsilon Q(u,u) + c_\epsilon |||u|||_{-1} \quad \text{for } u \text{ in degree } k \geq q; \tag{2.17}$$

moreover, we will prove that (2.17) holds for a strongly q-pseudoconvex exhaustion. (Here, the triplet $|||\cdot|||$ denotes the tangential norm (cf. [10]).)

(a) We begin by noticing that $\partial\bar\partial r + O(|r|)\mathrm{Id} \ge 0$ over k-forms for $k \ge q$. We can then apply Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and get

$$(r_{i\bar j})(u,\partial r) \le (r_{i\bar j})(u,u)^{\frac12} + O(|r|^{\frac12})|u|. \tag{2.18}$$

(b) The Levi form is a "$\frac12$-subelliptic multiplier" (cf. [10]), that is

$$|||\big((r_{i\bar j})(u,u)\big)^{\frac12}|||^2_{\frac12} \le Q(u,u). \tag{2.19}$$

This can be proved from the basic estimate

$$\int_D (r_{i\bar j})(Tu,u)dV \le Q(u,u),$$

by using the microlocalization T^+ and its decomposition $T^+ = (T^+)^{\frac12}(T^+)^{\frac12\,*}$. (Here dV is the element of volume.) Also, by Sobolev interpolation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(r_{i\bar j})(u,u)^{\frac12}\|^2 &\le \epsilon\|(r_{i\bar j})(u,u)^{\frac12}\|^2_{\frac12} + c_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1}\\ &\le \epsilon Q(u,u) + c_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1},\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

where $c_\epsilon \sim \epsilon^{-1}\|r\|_{C^2}$. Finally, we estimate the norm of the last term in (2.18). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(-r)^{\frac12}u\|^2 &\le \epsilon\|\zeta_\epsilon u\|^2_0 + \|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_0\\ &\le \epsilon\|u\|^2_0 + \|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_0 \lesssim \epsilon Q(u,u) + \|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_0,\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where ζ_ϵ is a cut-off outside of the ϵ-strip such that $|\dot\zeta_\epsilon| \lesssim \frac1\epsilon$(with $\zeta_\epsilon \equiv 1$ at bD). Moreover, we have

$$\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_0 \le \epsilon^3\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_1 + c_\epsilon\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_{-1}, \tag{2.22}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon^3\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2_1 &\underset{(i)}{\lesssim} \epsilon^3 Q_0((1-\zeta_\epsilon)u,(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u)\\ &\lesssim \epsilon^3 Q_0(u,u) + \epsilon^3\|\dot\zeta_\epsilon u\|^2_0\\ &\lesssim \epsilon^3 Q_0(u,u) + \epsilon^3\epsilon^{-2}\|u\|^2_0\\ &\underset{(ii)}{\lesssim} 2\epsilon Q_0(u,u),\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where (i) is Garding inequality applied to $(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u|_{bD} \equiv 0$ and (ii) follows from applying the basic estimate to $\|u\|^2_0$. Putting together (2.18)–(2.23), we get (2.17).

(c) We consider the exhaustion of D by the domains D_ρ defined by $r_\rho < 0$ for $r_\rho = r + \rho e^{A|z|^2}$; by a suitable choice of A, these domains are strongly q-pseudoconvex. We remark that

$\partial\bar\partial r_\rho \underset{\sim}{>} -\|r\|_{C^2}|r_\rho|\,\mathrm{Id} \geq -c|r_\rho|\,\mathrm{Id}$ over k forms for $k \geq q$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$(r^\rho_{i\bar j})(u, \partial r) \leq (r^\rho_{i\bar j})(u,u)^{\frac12} + c|r_\rho|^{\frac12}|u| \quad \text{for } u \text{ of degree } k \geq q. \tag{2.24}$$

The Levi form $(r^\rho_{i\bar j})$ is a $\frac12$-subelliptic multiplier (uniformly over ρ) and can be estimated as in (b) as well as the term with $O(|r_\rho|^{\frac12})$. Altogether, for fixed ϵ for any $\rho \leq \rho_\epsilon$ and for $\bar\Theta^*_\rho$ associated to the definng function r_ρ, we have got

$$\|\bar\Theta^*_\rho u\|^2 \leq \epsilon Q_{D_\rho}(u,u) + c_\epsilon \|u\|^2_{-1}, \tag{2.25}$$

uniformly with respect to ρ. Passing to the limit over ρ, yields (2.17).

□

Theorem 2.5. *Let D be q-pseudoconvex and assume that for any ϵ there is $|g_\epsilon| \sim 1$ such that*

$$|\bar\Theta^*_{g_\epsilon}(u)| \leq \epsilon |u|^2 \quad \textit{on } bD \textit{ for } u \textit{ in degree } k \geq q. \tag{2.26}$$

Then B_k is exactly H^s-regular for any s and any $k \geq q-1$.

Proof. (2.26) readily implies

$$\|\bar\Theta^*_{g_\epsilon} u\|^2 \underset{\sim}{<} \epsilon\|u\|^2 + \|g_\epsilon r\|_{C^2}\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2 \quad \text{for } u \text{ in degree } k \geq q. \tag{2.27}$$

By plugging (2.26) with the basic estimate $\|u\|^2 \underset{\sim}{<} Q(u,u)$ and the Garding inequality $\|g_\epsilon r\|_{C^2}\|(1-\zeta_\epsilon)u\|^2 \underset{\sim}{<} \epsilon Q(u,u) + c_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1}$, we get

$$\|\bar\Theta^*_{g_\epsilon} u\|^2 \underset{\sim}{<} \epsilon Q(u,u) + c_\epsilon \|u\|^2_{-1} \quad \text{for } u \in D_{\bar\partial^*} \text{ of degree } k \geq q. \tag{2.28}$$

This would give the H^s-regularity of B_k if we were able to prove the stability of (2.26) under a strongly q-pseudoconvex exhaustion. For this, we fix ϵ_o and $g_{\epsilon_o}r$ and approximate D by D_ρ defined by $g_{\epsilon_o}r + \rho e^{A|z|^2}$; for suitable fixed A, these are strongly q-pseudoconvex for any ρ. Also, if we rewrite $g_{\epsilon_o}r + \rho e^{A|z|^2} = g_{\epsilon_o,\rho}r_\rho$ for a normalized equation r_ρ of D_ρ, we have

$$\begin{cases} g_{\epsilon_o,\rho} \underset{C^2}{\to} g_{\epsilon_o}, \\ r_\rho \underset{C^2}{\to} r. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\bar\Theta^*_{\epsilon_o,\rho}(u) \to \bar\Theta^*_{\epsilon_o}(u) \quad \text{uniformly over } u.$$

We then apply Theorem 2.3 to each Ω_ρ and by uniformity of the estimate with respect to ρ we get that $B_k f$ belongs to H^s and satisfies (2.10).

□

Remark 2.6. We can give an alternative proof of Theorem 2.3 which uses Theorem 2.5. First, according to the lemma in [3], the existence of a plurisubharmonic defining function r implies the vector fields condition (1.1). (If r is only q-plurisubharmonic, (1.1) must be adpted by considering, similarly as in (2.26), the action over forms u of degree $k \geq q$.) If we knew that the good vector fields T_ϵ are of type $T_{g_\epsilon} = -i(N_{g_\epsilon} - \bar{N}_{g_\epsilon})$, then, by (2.8) we would get (2.26) and reach the conclusion from Theorem 2.5. In the general case, by [14] Proposition 5.26, the condition of good vector fields implies (2.26). (In that proposition, it is proved a generalization of (2.8). For any tangential vector field T_ϵ, not necessarily defined by (2.1), if we denote by g_ϵ its $(N - \bar{N})$-component, we have $[\bar\partial^*, T_\epsilon]|_{bD} = \bar\Theta^*_{g_\epsilon}|_{bD} T_\epsilon$ modulo elliptic multipliers (r and ∂r) and $\frac{1}{2}$-subelliptic multipliers ($\partial\bar\partial r$).)

Remark 2.7. We point out that in [13], Straube proves that (2.28) suffices for exact H^s-regularity for any s. This requires heavy work since, differently from (2.26), (2.28) is not tranferred from Ω to Ω_ρ.

3. Pseudodifferential calculus at the boundary

There is an important theory about the equivalence between $(-r)^\sigma$ and microlocal powers $T^{-\sigma}$ over harmonic functions; we need to develop this theory and allow the action over general functions controlling errors coming from the Laplacian. In this discussion, we do not modify r to r_g and T nor T_g. Also, we still write T but mean in fact its positive microlocalization T^+ which represents over v^+ the full elliptic standard operator Λ; for this reason, negative and fractionl powers of T make sense. We denote by U a neighborhood of bD,

Lemma 3.1. *We have*

$$\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} r^\sigma T^\sigma v\| \underset{\sim}{<} lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} v\| + sc\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} v\| + sc\|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\| \quad \textit{for any } v \in C^\infty(\bar{D} \cap U) \textit{ and } \sigma > -\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.1}$$

This is a generalization of [11] Lemma 2.6 in which the extra terms with power $\frac{\delta}{2}$ do not occur.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} r^\sigma T^\sigma v\|^2 &= ((-r)^{\delta+2\sigma} T^{2\sigma} v, v) \\
&= -(\partial_r(-r^{1+2\sigma+\delta}) T^{2\sigma} v, v) \\
&= 2\mathsf{Re}\,((-r)^{1+2\sigma+\delta} \partial_r T^{2\sigma} v, v) \\
&\leq lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} v\|^2 + sc\|(-r)^{1+2\sigma+\frac{\delta}{2}} \partial_r T^{2\sigma+\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} v\|^2 \\
&\underset{(*)}{\leq} lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} v\|^2 + sc\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} v\|^2 + sc\|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ follows from [11] (2.4) applied for $1 + 2\sigma + \frac{\delta}{2} > 0$.

□

In [11] there is a result, Lemma 2.6, which applies to powers $> -\frac{1}{2}$ of $-r$; we need a variant, still for negative powers, for terms involving $\partial_r v$.

Lemma 3.2. *We have*

$$\|(-r)^\sigma \partial_r T^\sigma v\| \lesssim \|v\| + \|rT^{-1}\Delta v\| + \|T^{-2}\Delta v\|, \quad v \in C^\infty(\bar{D} \cap U),\ \sigma > -\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. We have

$$\Big(\partial_r(-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r T^{2\sigma-2}v, \partial_r v\Big) = -2\mathsf{Re}\Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r^2 T^{2\sigma-2}v, \partial_r v\Big).$$

Write $\partial_r^2 = \Delta + Tan\partial_r + Tan^2 \sim \Delta + T\partial_r + T^2$. For the three terms Δ, T^2 and $T\partial_r$, we have the three relations below, respectively

$$\begin{cases} \Big(T^{-2}\Delta v, (-r)^{2\sigma+1}T^{2\sigma}\partial_r v\Big) \le \|T^{-2}\Delta v\|^2 + \|v\|^2, \\ \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}T^{2\sigma}v, \partial_r v\Big) = \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}T^{2\sigma+1}v, \partial_r T^{-1}v\Big) \\ \qquad\qquad \lesssim \|v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\|^2, \\ \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r T^{2\sigma-1}v, \partial_r v\Big) = \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r T^{(2\sigma+1)-1}v, \partial_r T^{-1}v\Big) \\ \qquad\qquad \le \|v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\|^2, \end{cases}$$

where the three inequalities come from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality combined with repeated use of [11] (2.4) (always under the choice $s = 0$ with the notations therein). Finally, we have to estimate the error term

$$\Big((r)^{2\sigma+1}[\Delta, T^{2\sigma-2}]v, \partial_r v\Big). \tag{3.3}$$

We express the commutator in (3.3) as

$$[\Delta, T^{2\sigma-2}] = T^{2\sigma-1} + \partial_r T^{2\sigma-2}.$$

Thus (3.3) splits into two terms to which the two inequalities below apply

$$\begin{cases} \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}T^{2\sigma-1}v, \partial_r v\Big) = \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}T^{(2\sigma+1)-1}v, T^{-1}\partial_r v\Big) \\ \qquad\qquad \le \|v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\|^2, \\ \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r T^{2\sigma-2}v, \partial_r v\Big) = \Big((-r)^{2\sigma+1}\partial_r T^{2\sigma-1}v, T^{-1}\partial_r v\Big) \\ \qquad\qquad \le \|v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\|^2. \end{cases}$$

$\square$

We are ready for the main technical tool in interchanging powers of $-r$ and T.

Proposition 3.3. *We have*

$$\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| \lesssim \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + \|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\| + \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^{-2}\Delta v\|. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. We start from [11] Lemma 2.11

$$\begin{aligned}\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| &\lesssim \|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + \|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\| \\ &\quad + \sum_j \|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_{\bar z_j}T^{-1}v\|.\end{aligned}$$

Now, the first and second terms in the right are good (in the right side of the estimate we wish to end with). As for the last, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j \Big((-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_{\bar z_j}T^{-1}v, (-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_{\bar z_j}T^{-1}v\Big) &\le \Big|\Big((-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta T^{-2}v, (-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\Big)\Big| \\ &\quad + 2\sum_j \Big|\mathsf{Re}\Big([(-r_\delta)^\delta, \partial_{z_j}]\partial_{\bar z_j}T^{-1}v, T^{-1}v\Big)\Big|.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The first term in the right is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\Big((-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta T^{-2}v, (-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\Big)\Big| &\le lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + sc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}(\partial_r^2 + \partial_r T + T^2)T^{-2}v\| \\ &\le lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + sc\Big(\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^{-2}\partial_r^2 v\| + \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_r T^{-1}v\|\Big) \\ &\le lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + sc\Big(\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^{-2}\Delta v\| + \|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\|\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The second term in the right of (3.5) has the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\mathsf{Re}\Big([(-r_\delta)^\delta, \partial_{z_j}]T^{-1}v, T^{-1}v\Big)\Big| &\lesssim \underbrace{\Big|\Big((-r)^{-1+\delta+\epsilon}T^{-1+\frac{\delta}{2}+\epsilon}v, (-r)^{-\epsilon}T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}-\epsilon}v\Big)\Big|}_{(i)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\Big|\Big((-r)^{-1+\delta}\partial_r T^{-1}v, T^{-1}v\Big)\Big|}_{(ii)}.\end{aligned}$$

To estimate (i), we write $-1+\delta+\epsilon = \frac{\delta}{2} + (-1+\frac{\delta}{2}+\epsilon) = \frac{\delta}{2}+\sigma$ under the choice of $\epsilon > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$ so that $-1+\frac{\delta}{2}+\epsilon > -\frac{1}{2}$. We then apply Lemma 3.1 and get the estimate of (i)

$$(i) \le lc\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\|^2 + sc(\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\|).$$

As for (ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(ii) &= \Big|\Big((-r)^{-1+\delta+(1-\frac{\delta}{2}-\epsilon)}\partial_r T^{-1-\epsilon}v, (-r)^{-1+\frac{\delta}{2}+\epsilon}T^{-1+\epsilon}v\Big)\Big| \\ &\lesssim sc\Big(\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\| + \|T^{-2}\Delta v\|\Big) \\ &\quad + lc\Big(\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}v\|^2 + \|-rT^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Delta v\|\Big).\end{aligned}$$

In fact, the term with lc in the last line comes from Lemma 3.1 applied for $\sigma = -1+\epsilon$ (which requires $\epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$). The term with sc is estimated by the aid of Lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned}\|(-r)^{-1+\delta+(1-\frac{\delta}{2}-\epsilon)}\partial_r T^{-1-\epsilon}v\| &= \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}-\epsilon}\partial_r T^{-1+(\frac{\delta}{2}-\epsilon)-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| \\ &\underset{(3.2)}{\lesssim} \|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}v\| + \|-rT^{-1}\Delta v\| + \|T^{-2}\Delta v\|.\end{aligned}$$

□

We decompose now $v = v^{(h)}+v^{(0)}$ where $v^{(h)}$ is the harmonic extension and $v^{(0)} := v-v^{(h)}$; note that $v^{(0)}|_{bD} \equiv 0$. We also recall the modification $\tilde{T}$ of T defined by (2.7) and designed to preserve $D_{\bar\partial^*}$.

Proposition 3.4. *We have*

$$\|[\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*]v^{(h)}\| \lesssim \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*]v^{(h)}\|, \quad v\in C^\infty(\bar D\cap U). \tag{3.6}$$

Remark 3.5. In turn, by (2.8), we have $[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*] = s\bar\Theta\tilde{T}^s$, and therefore (3.6) implies

$$\|[\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*]v^{(h)}\| \lesssim s\|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta\tilde{T}^s v^{(h)}\|. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. In fact, Jacobi identity yields

$$[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*] = -\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*] + \tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*] + [\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*]].$$

It follows

$$\tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*] = [\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*] + \tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*] - [\tilde{T}^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde{T}^{\frac{\delta}{2}},\bar\partial^*]]. \tag{3.8}$$

We apply $\tilde{T}^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ to both sides of (3.8) and use Proposition 3.3. The conclusion will follow once we are able to show that $-r\tilde{T}^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}[\Delta,[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*]]$ and $(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^2[\Delta,T^s\bar\partial^*]$ are error terms. In fact, we write

$$\begin{aligned}[\Delta,[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*]] &= [\partial_r^2+\partial_r Tan + Tan^2, Tan^s + \partial_r Tan^{s-1}] \\ &= Tan^{s-1} + \partial_r Tan^s \lesssim \tilde{T}^{s+1} + \partial_r\tilde{T}^s \qquad \text{modulo } \mathcal{S}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$\begin{cases}\|-rT^{-1\frac{\delta}{2}}[\Delta,[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*]]v^{(h)}\| \lesssim \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}v^{(h)}\| + \|-r\partial_r T^{s-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}v^{(h)}\| \underset{[11]\ (2.4)}{\lesssim} \|T^{s-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}v^{(h)}\|, \\ \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^{-2}[\Delta,[\tilde{T}^s,\bar\partial^*]]v^{(h)}\| \lesssim \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^{s-1}v^{(h)}\| + \|(-r)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_r T^{s-2}v^{(h)}\| \underset{[11]\ (2.4)}{\lesssim} \|T^{s-1-\frac{\delta}{2}}v^{(h)}\|.\end{cases}$$

□

4. Non-smooth plurisubharmonic defing functions

Definition 4.1. We say that D has a Diederich-Fornaess index $\delta=\delta_s$ for $0<\delta\le 1$ which controls the commutators of $\bar\partial$ and $\bar\partial^*$ with D^s over forms in degree $k\ge q$, when there is $r_\delta=g_\delta r$ for $g_\delta\in C^\infty$, $g_\delta\ne 0$, such that

$$\begin{cases} -(-r_\delta)^\delta \text{ is } q\text{-plurisubharmonic, that is, the sum of the first} \\ \qquad q \text{ eigenvalues of } \partial\bar\partial(-(-r_g)^\delta) \text{ is non-negative} \\ (1-\delta_s)\le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}$ can be chosen so that $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\le c_1e^{-c_2s\,\mathrm{diam}^2D}\sup\left(\frac{1}{|g|^s}\right)^{-1}$ or, alternatively, $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\le c_1e^{-c_2s\,\mathrm{diam}^2D\sup(1+\frac{|g'|}{|g|})}$.

Related to the above notion, is the condition

$$\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta^*_g u\|^2\le \mathcal{E}_{s,g}Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}(u,u), \tag{4.2}$$

for $\delta\le 1$.

Theorem 4.2. *If D is q-pseudoconvex and has a Diederich-Fornaess index $\delta=\delta_s$ which controls the commutators of $(\bar\partial,\bar\partial^*)$ with D^s in degree $k\ge q$, then B_k is s-regular for $k\ge q$.*

Remark 4.3. The proof consists in showing that (4.1) implies (4.2) (points (a) and (b) below) and then showing that (4.2) implies the conclusion. Note that, when $\delta=1$, we have in fact the better conclusion contained in Theorem 2.4.

Proof. We decompose a form as $u=u^\tau+u^\nu$ where u^τ and u^ν are the tangential and normal component respectively. We have

$$\begin{cases} \|u^\nu\|^2_1\le \sum_i\|\partial_{\bar z_i}u^\nu\|^2_0 \underset{\sim}{<} Q(u,u) \\ Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)\le Q(u,u)+Q(u^\nu,u^\nu) \\ \qquad\qquad\quad \underset{\sim}{<} Q(u,u)+\|u^\nu\|^2_1 \\ \qquad\qquad\quad \underset{\sim}{<} Q(u,u). \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Hence it suffices to prove (4.2). The same conclusion also applies to the decompositin $u=u^{(h)}+u^{(0)}$ and, in general, to any decomposition in which either of the two terms is 0 at bD.

(a) We have

$$\left|\partial\bar\partial r_\delta(u^\tau,\partial r_\delta)\right| \underset{\sim}{<} (1-\delta)^{\frac12}(-r_\delta)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Big(\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta)(u^\tau,u^\tau)\Big)^{\frac12}. \tag{4.4}$$

To see it, we start from

$$\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta)=\delta(-r_\delta)^{\delta-1}\partial\bar\partial r_\delta+(-r_\delta)^{\delta-2}\delta(1-\delta)\partial r\otimes\bar\partial r.$$

In particular,

$$\partial\bar\partial r_\delta = \frac{1}{\delta}(-r_\delta)^{1-\delta}\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta) - (-r_\delta)^{-1}(1-\delta)\partial r \otimes \bar\partial r.$$

We suppose that δ is bounded away from 0 and, indeed, that it approaches 1; thus we disregard it in the following. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\bar\partial r_\delta(u,\partial r_\delta) &\sim (-r_\delta)^{1-\delta}\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta)(u,\partial r_\delta) - (-r_\delta)^{-1}(1-\delta)\partial r_\delta \otimes \bar\partial r_\delta(u,\partial r_\delta)\\ &\le (-r_\delta)^{1-\delta}\Big(\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta)(u,u)\Big)^{\frac12}\Big((-r_\delta)^{-2+\delta}(1-\delta)|\partial r_\delta|^2 + O((-r_\delta)^{-1+\delta})\Big)^{\frac12}\\ &\qquad\qquad + (1-\delta)|\partial r_\delta|^2(-r_\delta)^{-1}|\partial r_\delta\cdot u|\\ &\lesssim \Big((1-\delta)^{\frac12}(-r_\delta)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} + O(-r_\delta)^{\frac12-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Big)\Big(\partial\bar\partial(-(r_\delta)^\delta)(u,u)\Big)^{\frac12} + (1-\delta)|\partial r_\delta|^2(-r_\delta)^{-1}|\partial r_\delta\cdot u|.\end{aligned}$$

Evaluation for $u = u^\tau$, yields (4.4).

(b) We prove now (4.2) using the basic estimates. Generally, these apply to smooth plurisubharmonic defining functions. However, in [11], Kohn has a version for Hölder continuous plurisubharmonic functions such as $-(-r_\delta)^\delta$. This implies the inequality $(*)$ below

$$\begin{aligned}\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta^*_g u^\tau\|^2 &\simeq \int_D(-r_\delta)^\delta\Big|\partial\bar\partial r_\delta(u^\tau,\partial r_\delta)\Big|^2 dV\\ &\underset{(4.4)}{\lesssim} (1-\delta)\int_D\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta)(u^\tau,u^\tau)dV\\ &\underset{(*)}{\lesssim} (1-\delta)Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}(u^\tau,u^\tau)\\ &\underset{(4.1)}{\lesssim} \mathcal{E}_{s,g}Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}(u^\tau,u^\tau).\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

This proves (4.2)

(c) We are therefore in the same situation as in Definition 2.1 apart from the term $(-r_\delta)^\delta$ which occurs in the integral in the left of (4.5) and in $Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$. As above, we continue to write T but take in fact its positive microlocalization T^+ which represents the full action of Λ over u^+. To carry on the proof, we suppose from now on that $f \in C^\infty(\bar D)$ and that B_k is H^s regular for some continuity constant c'; we prove that this implies continuity for a constant c which is solely related to the constants which occur in [**?**]. An exhaustion by domains endowed with H^s-regular projections B_k, $k \ge q$, will be discussed only at the end. We start from (2.11)

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}B_{k-1}f\| &\lesssim sc\|T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}B_{k-1}f\|^2 + lc\|T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}f\|\\ &\qquad + lc\|[\bar\partial^*, T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}]N_k\bar\partial f\|.\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

At this point, we need to convert $T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ into $(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T_g^s$ in the last term of (4.6) in order to enjoy (4.2). We also replace $N_k\bar\partial f$ by $(N_k\bar\partial f)^{(h)}$ where the supscript (h) denotes the harmonic extension. We apply the crucial estimate (3.6) to the last term in (4.6), regard as errors the terms which come in $(s-1)$-norm or in which vector fields of $\mathcal{S}$ occur, and get

(4.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[\bar\partial^*,\tilde T_g^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}](\bar\partial N_k f)^{(h)} \underset{(3.6)}{\le} \|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\tilde T_g^s,\bar\partial^*](\bar\partial N_k f)^{(h)}\|^2\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta_g^*\tilde T_g^s(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(h)}\|^2+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta_g^*\tilde T_g^s(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(h)\,\tau}\|^2+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta_g^*\tilde T^s(\bar\partial N_k f)^{\tau}\|^2+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\tilde T^s}((\bar\partial N_k f)^\tau,(\bar\partial N_k f)^\tau)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial,\tilde T^s](\bar\partial N_k f)^\tau\|^2+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial^*,\tilde T^s](\bar\partial N_k f)^\tau\|^2\Big)+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\tilde T^s}(\bar\partial N_k f,\bar\partial N_k f)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial,\tilde T^s]\bar\partial N_k f\|^2+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial^*,\tilde T^s]\bar\partial N_k f\|^2\Big)+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f\|^2+c_2s^2\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial N_k f\|^2\Big)+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<} s^2\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f\|^2+e^{2c_2\ s\,\mathrm{diam}^2D}c_2s^2\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f\|^2\Big)+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\substack{\sim\\(4.1)}}{<}\ sc\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f\|^2+\mathcal{E}^{(0)}+\text{error},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the notation $\mathcal{E}^{(0)}:=\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\Theta_g^*\tilde T_g^s(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\,\tau}\|^2$. Here in (4.1) we have chosen the first alternative $s^2\mathcal{E}_{s,g}e^{c_2s\,\mathrm{diam}^2D}\sup\Big(\frac{1}{|g|^s}\Big)\le c_1=sc$ (for a new c_2). (The other alternative $\mathcal{E}_{s,g}e^{c_2s\,\mathrm{diam}^2D\sup(1+\frac{|g'|}{|g|}}\le c_1=sc$ can be handled similarly as in Theorem 2.3 without replacing T_g by T. It is at this point, where the continuity of B_k in H^s, not just in C^∞, is needed; in fact, in formula (2.15) N_{φ_s} is H^s, not C^∞, continuous. We have to reconvert now $(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ into $T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$. We first suppose that we had started from $f^{(h)}$ and wished to prove the regularity for $B_{k-1}f^{(h)}$. We have

$$\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}T^s\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k(f^{(h)})\| \underset{[11]\ (2.4)}{\lesssim} \underbrace{\|T^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f^{(h)}\|}_{(i)} + \underbrace{\|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}-1}\Delta\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f^{(h)}\|}_{(ii)}.$$

Now,

$$(i) \lesssim \|T^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}f^{(h)}\|^2 + \|T^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}B_{k-1}f^{(h)}\|^2,$$

where the first term in the right is good and the second can be absorbed since it comes, inside (4.7), with sc. As for (ii),

$$\begin{aligned}(ii) &= \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}-1}(\bar\partial^*\bar\partial + \bar\partial\bar\partial^*)\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N_k f^{(h)}\| + \text{error}\\ &= \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}-1}(\bar\partial^*\bar\partial(\bar\partial\bar\partial^* + \bar\partial^*\bar\partial)N_k f^{(h)}\| + \text{error}\\ &= \|-rT^{s\frac{\delta}{2}-1}\bar\partial^*\bar\partial f^{(h)}\| + \text{error}.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{cases}\bar\partial^*\bar\partial = Tan^2 + \partial_r Tan + \partial_r^2 \sim T^2 + \partial_r T + \partial_r^2,\\ \partial_r^2 = \Delta + Tan^2 + \partial_r Tan \sim \Delta + T^2 + \partial_r T,\end{cases}$$

which implies

$$\bar\partial^*\bar\partial \sim T^2 + \partial_r T + \Delta.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned}\|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}-1}\bar\partial^*\bar\partial f^{(h)}\| &= \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}-1}(T^2 + \partial_r T + \Delta)f^{(h)}\|\\ &\le \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}+1}f^{(h)}\| + \|-rT^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}\partial_r f^{(h)}\|\\ &\underset{[11]\ (2.4)}{\lesssim} \|T^{s-\frac{\delta}{2}}f^{(h)}\|,\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

which is good. As for the term $f^{(0)}$, the regularity of $B_{k-1}f^{(0)}$ follows readily, without using the machinery (a)–(c) above, from elliptic regularity

$$\|T^s N_{k-1}f^{(0)}\| \lesssim \|T^{s-2}f^{(0)}\|. \tag{4.9}$$

(Note that N_{k-1} makes sense even for $k-1=0$ when acting on $f^{(0)}|_{bD} \equiv 0$ because $\Box$ is, under this restriction, invertible.)

We pass to the term which has been omitted in the estimate of $\bar\Theta_g^*$, that is, $\mathcal{E}^{(0)}$. The use of elliptic regularity is different here and applies to $(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)}$ instead of $f^{(0)}$; it then passes though Q instead of $\Box$ and through Boas-Straube formula. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar{\Theta}^*_g\tilde{T}^s_g(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau}\|^2 \underset{\sim}{<} \sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar{\Theta}^*_g\tilde{T}^s(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau}\|^2\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<}\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\tilde{T}^s}((\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau},(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau)})+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial,\tilde{T}^s](\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau}\|^2+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial^*,\tilde{T}^s](\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)\tau}\|^2\Big)+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\underset{\sim}{<}\mathcal{E}_{s,g}\sup\frac{1}{|g|^{2s}}\Big(Q_{(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\tilde{T}^s}(\bar\partial N_k f,\bar\partial N_k f)+\text{error}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial,\tilde{T}^s]\bar\partial N_k f\|^2+\|(-r_\delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}[\bar\partial^*,\tilde{T}^s]\bar\partial N_k f\|^2\Big)+\text{error}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.10}
$$

This is the same as (4.7) with the advantage that in the last line the Sobolev indices have decreased by -1 since terms with superscript (0) vanish at bD; these are therefore error terms. Also there remain to control $\|T^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar{\Theta}^*_g\tilde{T}^s_g(\bar\partial N_k f)^{(0)}\|$ and $\|-r^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\bar{\Theta}^*_g\tilde{T}^s_g(\bar\partial N_k f)^{\nu}\|$; but these are controlled by elliptic regularity as in (4.10). Summarizing up, we have proved that for a suitable c, only related to the constants in (4.1), we have

$$\|B_k f\|_s \le c\|f\|_s \tag{4.11}$$

if we knew that it holds for some $c' >> c$. We show now that we can exhaust D by domains D_ρ endowed with continuous projections B_k, $k \ge q-1$ for some c' and which inherit the assumption of Theorem 4.2 with uniform constants with respect to ρ. For this, we define $D_\rho = \{z : r_\delta(z) + \rho < 0\}$. We first notice that, bD_ρ being also defined by $-(-r_\delta)^\delta + \rho^\delta < 0$, it has a smooth q-plurisubharmonic defining function. Hence, by Theorem 2.4, B_k is H^s-regular for any $k \ge q-1$. Coming back to the initial defining function $r_\delta + \rho$, this satisfies $\partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta-\rho)^\delta) \ge \partial\bar\partial(-(-r_\delta)^\delta$; thus the Diederich-Fornaess index of D_ρ is $\ge \delta$. Also, if for the new boundary we rewrite $r_\delta + \rho = g_{\delta,\rho} r_\delta$, for a normalized equation r_ρ of D_ρ, and if $\mathcal{E}_{s,g,\rho}$ are the constants which occur in (4.1), then

$$
\begin{cases}
g_{\delta,\rho} \underset{C^2}{\to} g_\delta,\\
\mathcal{E}_{s,g,\rho} \underset{C^2}{\to} \mathcal{E}_{s,g}.
\end{cases}
$$

Thus, the estimate (4.11) passes from the D_ρ's (in which it has been proved thanks to the regularity of the B_k (for a different c')) to the initial domain D.

The proof is complete.

$\Box$

References

[1] **D.E. Barret**—Behavior of the Bergman projection on the Diederich-Fornaess worm, *Acta Math.* **168** (1992), 1-10

[2] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Equivalence of regularity for the Bergman projection and the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator, *Manuscripta Math.* **67** (1990) 25–33.

[3] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Sobolev estimates for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator on domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ admitting a defining function that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary, *Math. Z.* **206 (1)** (1991) 81–88.

[4] **K. Diederich and J.E. Fornaess**—Pseudoconvex domains: bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions, *Invent. Math.* **39** (1977), 129–141

[5] **P. Harrington**—Global regularity for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator and bounded plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions, Preprint (2011)

[6] **A. K. Herbig and J. D. McNeal** — Regularity of the Bergman projection on forms and plurisubharmonicity conditions. *Math. Ann.* 336 (2006), **2** , 335–359.

[7] **T.V. Khanh**—Global hypoellipticity of the Kohn-Laplacian $\Box_b$ on pseudoconvex CR manifolds, (2010) Preprint.

[8] **J.J. Kohn and L. Nirenberg**—Non-coercive boundary value problems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **18** (1965), 443–492

[9] **J. J. Kohn**—Global regularity for $\bar\partial$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds, *Trans. of the A.M.S.* **181** (1973), 273–292.

[10] **J.J. Kohn**—Subellipticity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains: sufficient conditions, *Acta Math.* **142** (1979), 79–122

[11] **J.J. Kohn**—Quantitative estimates for global regularity, *Analysis and geometry in several complex variables, Trend Math. Birkhäuser* Boston (1999), 97–128

[12] **S. Krantz and M. Peloso**—Analysis and geometry on worm domains, *J. Geom. Anal.* **18** (2008), 478-510

[13] **E. Straube**—A sufficient condition for global regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator, *Adv. in Math.* **217** (2008), 1072–1095

[14] **E. Straube**—Lectures on the L^2-Sobolev theory of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem, *ESI Lect. in Math. and Physics* (2010)

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Padova, via Trieste 63, 35121 Padova, Italy
E-mail address: `pinton@math.unipd.it, zampieri@math.unipd.it`